

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 17 are amended and claims 20-22 are added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 10 and 17 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 9, lines 6-11. Support for new claims 20-22 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 27, lines 15-24. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen at the personal interview held March 27, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 10, 11, 14-16 and 17-19

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 7-9, 10, 11, 14-16 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,095,628 to Rhome in view of Tanaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As argued during the personal interview, Rhome and Tanaka, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest "the fixed side structure including a first side, a second side, and a length between the first side and the second side, the length only including a slide mechanism; ... wherein during a printing operation onto the workpiece, the medium conveyance section is controlled so as to move along the slide mechanism from the second position where it projects partially from the slide mechanism from the first side of the fixed side structure to a third position where it projects partially from the slide mechanism from the second side, and then returns again to the second position where it projects partially from the slide mechanism from the first side," as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 17 (emphasis added).

Rhome does not disclose a fixed side structure that has a first side and a second side with a slide mechanism only being in between. Rhome merely discloses a housing 12 that includes straight rails 42 on which the carriage assembly 26/28 can slide forward and rearward with respect to the length of the apparatus 10 (Rhome, col. 2, lines 54-60 and Fig. 6). However, housing 12 of Rhome is not a fixed side structure. Furthermore, the straight rails 42 are not along the length between the first and second side of the housing 12. As shown in Fig. 6, the straight rails 42 of Rhome are shorter than the length between the alleged first and second side. As a result, the platen 16 of Rhome, which is supported by the carriage assembly 26/28, does not project partially from the slide mechanism from the rear of the housing, and is actually contained within the length of the housing. Thus, Rhome does not disclose the claimed fixed side structure.

Further, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Rhome. Tanaka is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a medium conveyance section that is positioned within the length of the fixed side structure, when a power supply to the device is in an off state. Tanaka does not disclose a printing device that includes a fixed side structure and a medium conveyance section that moves to a second position and third position of a fixed sided structure. Thus, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Rhome.

Finally, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Tanaka with the apparatus of Rhome. Rhome relates to ink printing apparatus with an opening for the platen 16 where the working surface is placed (Rhome, Abstract and col. 3, lines 40-50). Tanaka relates to a disk device (Tanaka, Abstract). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Tanaka with the ink printing apparatus of Rhome.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 10 and 17 are patentable over Rhome and Tanaka. Further, claims 3, 7-9, 10, 11, 14-16 and 17-19, which variously depend

from claims 1, 10 and 17, are also patentable over Rhome and Tanaka, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 10 and 17, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 12 and 13

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rhome in view of Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,444 to Drynkin et al. (Drynkin). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rhome, Tanaka and Drynkin, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 4, 5, 12 and 13. Drynkin does not remedy the deficiencies of Rhome and Tanaka discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10. Drynkin is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a cover. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 10. Thus, claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 are patentable over Rhome, Tanaka and Drynkin for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 30, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--